

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

AUSTIN A. HASKINS,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	4:05cv3279
	)	
vs.	)	ORDER to SHOW CAUSE
	)	(Service of Process)
MIKE KENNEY, et al,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

This matter is before the court sua sponte. Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m) establishes a time limit for service of process on the defendants in a civil case. In the court's Order on Initial Review directing the issuance of summons forms, the court notified the plaintiff of the deadline for service of process on the defendants. The plaintiff was warned that failure to return completed forms for timely service of process by the U.S. Marshal on the defendants could result in dismissal of this matter without prejudice. The deadline for service of process has expired, and the court's records show no return of the forms for service of process and no proof of service of process on any defendant.<sup>1</sup>

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED:

1. That by **August 25, 2006**, the plaintiff may file a pleading entitled Response to Order to Show Cause explaining why the above-entitled case should not be dismissed, without prejudice, for failure to obtain timely service of process on any defendant; and

2. That in the absence of a timely **and sufficient** Response to Order to Show Cause, this case may be subject, without further notice, to dismissal without prejudice by Chief Judge Joseph F. Bataillon.

DATED this 7<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2006.

BY THE COURT:

s/ F. A. GOSSETT  
United States Magistrate Judge

---

<sup>1</sup>In filing no. 17, in response to the plaintiff's inquiry, the court explained how to obtain the address for one of the defendants. Even so, the plaintiff has failed to return the paperwork.